

REMARKS

Applicant notes that the text “a blind frame having” in line 8 of claim 19, as last presented, did not appear in the original, and therefore should not have been stricken out; and that the last three lines in claim 19 did not appear in the original, and should have been underlined in the last amendment. Applicant accordingly proposes canceling claim 19, and replacing it with a new claim 20 identical to claim 19 as allowed by the Examiner (with one exception, noted below) as the easiest way to make the correction.

The exception is this: the upper/lower canopy limitations of claim 1 were intentionally not added to claim 19 in the June 14, 2006 Amendment (as pointed out by applicant in the accompanying remarks on page 11 of the un-entered March 20, 2006 Amendment, which remarks were incorporated by reference in the June Amendment). But claim 19 describes the seat’s location as below “the lower” canopy support arms, without antecedent basis for “the lower”, a typographical error. Applicant has accordingly omitted the word “lower” from new claim 20, eliminating the antecedent basis issue without changing the scope of the claim. But please also note that, although the Examiner’s statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 1 and 19 in the August 17, 2006 ex parte Quayle action focuses on the “baseless lower end” limitation, it also mentions the upper and lower canopy support arms (which appear only in claim 1). Given the pointed omission by applicant of the upper/lower limitations from claim 19, this mention appears to have been an oversight by the Examiner with respect to claim 19, rather than a basis for allowance. It is accordingly submitted that omitting “lower” in claim 20 does not affect the basis for allowance for this claim.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this response, she is invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney by phone at 231-932-9752.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason J. Young/

Jason J. Young, Reg. No. 34, 048